



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/989,801 | 11/19/2001 | Jason F. Hunzinger | 09752-101001 | 1623 |
| 27572 | 7590 | 05/21/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| HARNESSE, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C. | | | FOX, BRYAN J | |
| P.O. BOX 828 | | | ART UNIT | |
| BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |

2686

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,801

Applicant(s)

HUNZINGER, JASON F.

Examiner

Bryan J Fox

Art Unit

2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s), _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-9,12-14 and 17 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,10,11,15 and 16 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, the phrase "each mobile station a slot has a unique partial address" is indefinite. Specifically, the examiner is unclear if the applicant intends to claim "each mobile station in a slot has a unique partial address" or "for each mobile station a slot has a unique partial address" or "each mobile station slot has a unique partial address".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey (US006577874B1) in view of Alley et al (US006487264B1).

Regarding claim 1, Dailey discloses a system where a base station selects a temporary identification number for a mobile terminal (see column 4, lines 58-65), which reads on the claimed "method of addressing mobile stations in a wireless communication system". The radio base station has stored in base station memory a table of mobile identification numbers associated with assigned temporary logical identification numbers (see column 13, lines 3-8), which reads on the claimed "obtaining a list of mobile addresses". Dailey fails to teach using a portion of the address as the temporary address.

Alley et al discloses an RF modem apparatus (see column 1, lines 17-22) that uses the least significant byte in place of the full 32 bit address (see column 12, lines 45-49), which reads on the claimed "determining a partial address length and portion to communicate with each mobile station".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Alley et al to include the above use of the least significant byte in order to simplify the determination of the temporary ID.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Dailey and Alley et al teaches the use of the least significant byte as the temporary ID (see Alley et al column 12, lines 45-49), which reads on the claimed "selecting a consecutive portion of the address as the partial address".

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Dailey and Alley et al discloses that by using a relatively short temporary identification number, messages can be sent and received over a single time slot (see Dailey column 5, lines 21-25), which reads on the claimed "setting the partial address length to a frame length or less".

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Dailey and Alley et al discloses that by assigning a relatively short temporary identification number, messages from the mobile terminal can include more payload information (see Dailey column 5, lines 6-10), which reads on the claimed "selecting a partial address length to minimize the bits transmitted by the wireless communication system".

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Dailey and Alley et al discloses that the temporary logical identification number is used to identify the mobile terminal in a group call origination message (see Dailey column 11, lines 3-9), which reads on the claimed "addressing the mobile stations using addresses of the partial address length".

4. Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Alley et al, and further in view of Rossin (US005781143A).

Regarding claim 8, Dailey discloses a system where a base station selects a temporary identification number for a mobile terminal (see column 4, lines 58-65) in a cellular communications system where a base station can provide radio telephone communications to one or more mobile terminals (see column 1, lines 30-49), which reads on the claimed "wireless communication system comprising a plurality of mobile stations" and "base station which communicates with the plurality of mobile stations",

each station having a MIN which uniquely identifies it (see column 11, lines 33-37), which reads on the claimed "each mobile station has a unique address". The radio base station has stored in base station memory a table of mobile identification numbers associated with assigned temporary logical identification numbers (see column 13, lines 3-8). Dailey fails to teach using a portion of the address as the temporary address.

Alley et al discloses an RF modem apparatus (see column 1, lines 17-22) that uses the least significant byte in place of the full 32-bit address (see column 12, lines 45-49), which reads on the claimed "determine a partial address length and portion to communicate with each mobile station".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Alley et al to include the above use of the least significant byte in order to simplify the determination of the temporary ID. Alley et al fails to expressly disclose the comparing of addresses.

Rossin discloses a method of assigning identifiers where a receiver compares a transmitted ID to the ID numbers in EEPROM to determine if the ID is already assigned.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Alley et al in order to prevent assigning the same ID to two different terminals.

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Dailey, Alley et al and Rossin discloses the use of a TDMA system using frames (see column 5, lines 21-25). In TDMA systems, a mobile terminal monitors a slot for its address to determine if it is being paged.

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Dailey, Alley et al and Rossin discloses that the least significant byte may be used as the temporary ID (see Alley et al column 12, lines 45-49), which reads on the claimed "the partial address is selected from consecutive bits of the unique address".

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Dailey, Alley et al and Rossin discloses that by using a relatively short temporary identification number, messages can be sent and received over a single time slot (see Dailey column 5, lines 21-25), which reads on the claimed "the partial address length is frame length or less".

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Fan et al (US006625124B1).

Regarding claim 14, Dailey discloses a system where a base station selects a temporary identification number for a mobile terminal (see column 4, lines 58-65), which reads on the claimed "wireless communication system". Dailey fails to teach varying the address lengths.

Fan et al discloses a method of reassigning shortened addresses to each device on the network (see column 3, lines 24-26) where the length of short addresses in bits is determined most simply by the number of bits needed to provide a unique short address to each device (see column 5, lines 60-65), which reads on the claimed "varying the address length" and "selecting a partial address length which results in each terminal of the wireless communication system obtaining unique partial address".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Fan et al to include the different address lengths in

order to provide overhead savings as suggested by Fan et al (see column 5, lines 54-59).

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Fan et al as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Alley et al (US006487264B1).

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Dailey and Fan et al fails to expressly disclose the use of consecutive bits in the temporary address.

Alley et al discloses an RF modem apparatus (see column 1, lines 17-22) that uses the least significant byte in place of the full 32-bit address (see column 12, lines 45-49), which reads on the claimed "determine a partial address length and portion to communicate with each mobile station".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Fan et al with Alley et al to include the above use of part of the full address in the temporary address in order to simplify the determination of the temporary ID.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 2, the prior art applied fails to disclose or render obvious a method of addressing mobile stations in a wireless communication system comprising: obtaining a list of mobile addresses; and determining a partial address length and portion to communicate with each mobile station, further comprising sorting the list of mobile addresses by slot location so that each mobile station a slot has a unique partial address.

Regarding claim 10, the prior art applied fails to disclose or render obvious a wireless communication system comprising: a plurality of mobile stations, wherein each mobile station has a unique address; a base station which communicates with the plurality of mobile stations, the base station comparing the addresses of each mobile station to determine a partial address length at which each mobile station may be uniquely identified, wherein each of the mobile stations monitors a specific slot for its address and wherein the base station determines a partial address length at which each mobile station with a specific slot may be uniquely identified.

Regarding claim 15, the prior art applied fails to disclose or render obvious a method of varying the address length in a wireless communication system comprising: selecting a partial address length which results in each terminal of the wireless communication system obtaining a unique partial address, further comprising dividing the addresses into groups based on the monitored slot, wherein each address in a group is unique.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Perelman (EP000507125A2) discloses a method and apparatus for addressing users in a network.

Le Goff et al (US006438127B1) discloses a process and apparatus for the operation of virtual private networks on a common data packet communication network.

Moon et al (US 20030123413A1) discloses RSMA control device and method for mobile communication system.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J Fox whose telephone number is (703) 305-8994. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bryan Fox
3/5


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER